# A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITENESS IN SOME OF HAROLD PINTER'S PLAYS

**Prof.Dr.Zeydan K. Omar**

**Sura Abdul Wahid H.**

**College Of Education for Humanities**

**Anbar University**

## Abstract

This paper offers a theoretical exploration of impoliteness in some of Harold Pinter's plays. This paper also examines the ways in which interactants use impolite behaviors or utterances to achieve their purposes . Impoliteness as a well known fact is the opposite of politeness and part of social interaction. This research analyzes three plays of Pinter and examines how impoliteness is used to reflect the relationships between the characters.

الخلاصة

يقوم البحث الحالي بعرض أطار نظري لعدم الكياسة في بعض من مسرحيات هارولد بنتر ويبحث أيضا الأساليب التييقوم المتكلمين باستخدامها عند استعمال الكلمات أو التصرفات الغير مهذبة لتحقيق أغراضهم. والمعروف جيدا أن عدم الكياسة هي عكس التأدب وجزء من التفاعل الاجتماعي ويحلل هذا البحث ثلاث مسرحيات لبنتر، ويدرس كيفية استخدام عدم الكياسة لعكس العلاقات بين الأشخاص٠

## 1-Introduction

Impoliteness is a new area of study which appears in the 2000s . For pragmaticians and sociolinguists , impoliteness is worth for study with social

interaction ,since it is part of it just as politeness but from different perspectives . Elen (2001:41) has noted that impoliteness has been ignored and called it as the conceptual bias in approaches to politeness . Thus , impoliteness represents everything that interprets and causes social harmony(Culpeper, et al ,2003:1548).

In fact, there are certain rules that govern social interaction and any break of those rules creates impoliteness . For this reason , impoliteness is a break from the hypothesized norms of a community of practice (Mills,2005: 262). According to Thomas' view(1995:149), impoliteness is the opposite of politeness in orientation to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory(1987). Thus, Culpeper explicitly abandons Brown and Levinson's distinction between positive and negative face and assesses interaction within context. Respectively , the context plays an essential role in the interpretation of impoliteness. The problem within this study is the misinterpretation or misunderstanding of impoliteness .

Moreover, impoliteness can be interpreted differently by different persons depending on the context and other elements. Additionally, the hearer may interpret the speaker's utterances as impolite even though these utterances are not meant by the speaker and this will cause an attack between the speaker and the hearer. This paper aims to show the role of impoliteness in interactional communication and its function in Pinter's plays .Pinter is selected for this study since he is a modern writer and portrays the life of modern man who always seeks an outlet to gain power , respects and to reach a high status by many ways and impoliteness is one of the ways .

## 2. Perspectives On Politeness And Impoliteness

### 2.1 Politeness

Politeness is one of the most important aspect of human communication .It is not something human beings are born with , but something which is acquired through a process of socialization . This means that politeness is not a natural phenomenon which existed before mankind but one which has been socioculturally and historically constructed . The term 'polite' goes back to the 15th century and etymologically derives from the Latin word 'politus' which means 'smoothed ,accomplished' . Thus , 'polite' is associated with concepts such as 'polished, refined' and so on referring to people(Reiter,2000:2). Politeness is about the strategic manipulation of language about expediting our conversational goals by saying which is socially appropriate (Culpeper et al ,2003:1547).

Moreover , politeness is a form of social interaction that mediates between the individual and the social . Language can be used to encourage , discourage , enhance good communication or even cause conflict between interlocutors because we need to use polite language for fruitful communication . The basic social role of politeness is in its ability to function as a way of controlling potential aggression between interacting parties. In fact , politeness is a basic form of cooperation and it underlies all language in some way or another(Cutting,2002:54). Lakoff(1973:88 as cited in Schauer,2009:10) is the first scholar who concentrates on linguistic politeness in a pragmatic sense . She calls the mother of modern politeness and links politeness to Grice's cooperative principle .

### 2.1.1 Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory (1978/1987).

Politeness theory is first systematized by Brown and Levinson. Brown and Levinson (1978)explain the nature of politeness and how it functions in interaction . In fact ,most politeness theories are developed to account for face to face interaction (Brown and Levinsons,1987:68).The concept of' face' is at the

core of Brown and Levinson's theory to politeness. Brown and Levinson(1987)outline different kinds of politeness strategies and these strategies sum up human politeness behavior and they are treated as speaking in conformity:

## 1-Bald on record strategy

This strategy is performed in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way as possible. It is the most effective way for the speaker to get his message through to the hearer but the speaker ignores the hearer's face and its wants. Here, the utterance is maximally efficient with regards to Grice's conversational maxims . According to Brown and Levinson , we do not follow these maxims in conversations but they motivate the speakers to pay attention to the face wants and avoid conflict Brown and Levinson(1987:94).

## 2-Positive politeness strategy

Positive politeness strategy is redressive directed to the addressee's positive face: his desire that his wants should be thought of as desirable. This strategy is used to promote high involvement and solidarity. Positive politeness is not necessarily redressive of the particular face want infringed by the FTA but a kind of social accelerator such as joking . Brown and Levinson(1987:163) have divided this strategy into three main groups and these groups have sub-strategies as follows:

A-The speaker claims common ground: Notice , attend to H , Exaggeration , Intensify interest to H , Use in-group identity markers such as address forms , dialect , jargon or slang, Seek agreement with safe topics, Avoid disagreement, Presuppose/assert common ground, Joke.

B- The speaker conveys that he and the hearer are cooperate: Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants , Offer/promise , Be

optimistic, Include both S and H in the activity, Give (or ask) reasons , Assume or assert reciprocity

C-The speaker fulfills the hearer's want for something: Give gifts to H

3-Negative politeness strategy

Negative politeness strategy is redressive action addressed to the hearer's negative face :his wants to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded . These strategies perform the function of minimizing the particular imposition of FTA (Brown and Levinson,1987:129).These strategies are:

1-Be indirect: Be conventionally indirect

2-Don't presume /assume : Questions, hedge on illocutionary force , prosodic/kinesic hedge

3-Don't coerce H : Be pessimistic , Minimize the imposition ,Rx, Give deference

4-Communicate S's want to be not impinge on H:

-Apologize, Impersonalize S and H, State the FTA as a general rule, Nominalize

5-Redress other wants of H's: Go on record incurring a debt or as not indebting H

4-Off- record strategy

Brown and Levinson(1987:211) explain that the off-record strategy is used by the speaker to achieve a communicative intention indirectly . In other words , the speaker is trying to avoid the responsibility of doing an FAT .In these strategies , the hearer decides how to interpret the speaker's utterance (FTA). The FTA is performed 'off-record' typically through the use of an indirect

illocutionary act which has more than one interpretation. The off-record strategies are:

A-Invite conversational implicature : Give hints , Give association rules , Presuppose , Understate , Overstate, Use tautologies, Use contradictions, Be ironic, Use metaphors, Use rhetorical questions .

B-Be vague or ambiguous: violate the manner maxim: Be ambiguous , Be vague, Over-generalize, Displace H ,Be incomplete, use ellipsis (Brown and Levinson,1987:213-27).

5-Don't perform the FTA

Brown and Levinson(1987) do not discuss this strategy but others like Tanaka(1993) discusses two shorts of 'saying nothing' . This means that there are times when the speaker decides to say nothing and wishes to achieve the effect which the speech act would have on certain circumstances .Tanaka terms these strategies as ooc-genuine and ooc-strategyic(Tanaka,1993: 50 as cited in Thomas,1995:175).

**-ooc-genuine:** S does not perform a speech act , and genuinely intends to let the matter remain closed. S/he does not intend to achieve the perlocutionary effect .

**-ooc-strategic:** S does not perform a speech act ,but expects A to infer his/her wish to achieve the perlocutionary effect. Therefore, some utterances pose no face threat at all but it is a matter of interest of social harmony.

## 2.2 Impoliteness

Within the domain of pragmatics , the concept of impoliteness comprises a new and interesting field of studies next to and complementing politeness studies .Impoliteness is a break from the hypothesized norms of a community of practice .It is attributed to a speaker on the basis of assessments of his intention and motivations(Mills,2005:122). Leech(2005)argues "my position incidentally ,is that a theory of politeness is inevitably also a theory of impoliteness ,since

impoliteness is non-observance or violation of the constraints of politeness (Leech,2005:18).

Culpeper (1996)defines impoliteness as "the opposite of politeness ". his initial work is based on Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness but Culpeper(2005:355)reformulates his model of impoliteness as "the parasite of politeness" .Furthermore, Culpeper changes his model in order to incorporate with the discursive nature of social interaction. Impoliteness aims at damage a person's identity and face. Culpeper et al (2003) note that impoliteness is the use of strategies which are designed to attack the hearer's face and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony(Culpeper et al ,2003:1550). Impoliteness is an attitude that is activated by a specific kinds of behaviors in specific context (Culpeper,2011:42).Fraser and Nolan(1981:96) also point out to the importance of context :

> *" no sentence is inherently polite or impolite we often take certain expressions to be impolite , but it is not the expressions themselves but the conditions under which they are used that determine the judgment of politeness".*

Elen(2001:45) argues that politeness and impoliteness are two sides of a coin . Here, he means that there are always two sides to whatever kind of language behavior we engage in. One side is positive (politeness) and the other is negative(impoliteness).In fact, impoliteness focuses on intention and reception . Mills(2003:124) stresses that impoliteness is not the opposite of politeness but she suggests that persons can deal with impoliteness by using the same analytical concepts as those relevant to the analysis of politeness. Furthermore, impoliteness can be expressed directly and indirectly .Directness is often

characterized as face-threatening acts. In English indirectness is polite and directness is considered impolite . Moreover, the concepts of directness and indirectness depend on cultures and societies which differ from one culture or society to another. For example, Chinese and Japanese's people consider directness as an impolite way of speaking .Whilst German people consider directness as a positive polite value in speaking. There are many factors which are used in the analysis of impoliteness such as gender, power, social norms and culture, etc.

Impoliteness often involves a clash and conflict of behaviors associated with particular context and refers to inappropriate behavior. Culpeper(2011:63) explains that rudeness refers to cases where the offence is unintentionally caused (a matter of relational mismanagement).Whilst impoliteness refers to cases where the offence is intentionally caused (a matter of negatively –oriented relational management). Thus ,impoliteness includes intentional face-attack and rudeness includes unintentional face-attack. According to Baron and Richardson(1994), aggression is any form of behavior directed towards the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment (Baron and Richardson,1994 :37).

Impoliteness is an exercise of power and power is expressed through language and cannot be explained without contextualization. Culpeper(1996)argues that :

> *A powerful participant has more freedom to be impolite because he/she can(a) reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness e.g. through the denial of speaking rights and (b) threaten more severe retaliation should the less powerful participant be impolite(Culpeper,1996:354).*

In sum , Culpeper explains that impoliteness occurs in a situation where there is an imbalance of social structure power.

## 3. Models Of Impoliteness And Aggravation

### 3.1 Lachenicht's model of aggravation(1980)

Both Lachenicht(1980) and Culpeper(1996)take Brown and Levinson's model of politeness as the underlying point of departure for their work. Lachenicht (1980:607)considers the use of 'aggravating language' as an attempt to hurt or damage the hearer. Hurt is achieved by:(a) Conveying that the speaker is not liked and does not belong (positive aggravation),(b) By interfering with the hearer's freedom of action (negative aggravation). Culpeper(1996:349)notes that impoliteness is the use of utterances or actions that attack one's interlocutor and cause disharmony and/or social disturbance rather than promoting social harmony. Lachenicht(1980)gives four aggravation strategies and explains that these strategies can be selected in accordance with the degree of threat as in the following:

1- Off record:ambiguous insults, insinuations, hints, and irony. This strategy is of much the same kind as the politeness strategy, and is designed to enable the insulter to meet an aggrieved challenge from the injured person with an assertion of innocence .It can be used against powerful hearers and it is used indirectly.

2- Bald on record:directly produced FTAs and impositions (‘Shut that door’, ‘Do your work’, ‘Don’t talk’, etc.) of the same kind as in the politeness strategy.

3-Positive aggravation:an aggravation strategy that is designed to show the addressee that he is not approved of, is not esteemed, does not belong, and will not receive cooperation.It is used against friends .

4-Negative aggravation: An aggravation strategy that is designed to impose on the addressee, to interfere with his freedom of action, and to attack his social

position and the basis of his social action. It is used against those more socially distant (Lachenicht ,1980: 619).

## 3.2 Culpeper's model of impoliteness(1996-2003)

Culpeper emphasizes that impoliteness arises in social interaction . So he argues for the adoption of a more contextually and culturally sensitive model of face. Culpeper(1996: 356) takes Brown and Levinson's strategies and inverts them to describe impoliteness and their purpose is to attack the hearer's face instead of trying to save them. These strategies are:

1-Bald on record impoliteness

According to the development of the model(Culpeper,1996,2003) bald on record impoliteness is seen as typically being deployed where there is much face at sake and where there is an intention on the part of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer and/or where the speaker does not have the power to (safely) utter an impolite utterance . The utterances are deployed in a direct , clear , unambiguous and concise way in situations where face is not irrelevant or minimized(Culpeper,2005:41).

2-Positive impoliteness

Positive impoliteness involves the use of strategies deployed to damage the hearer's positive face wants . Culpeper gives a list of examples about this strategy which include:

-Ignore, snub the other-fail to acknowledge the other's presence.

-Exclude the other from an activity.
-Disassociate from the other-for example ,deny association or common ground with other , avoid sitting together.
-Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic.
-Use inappropriate identity markers- for example , use titles and surname when a close relationship pertains , or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains.
-Use obscure or secretive language-for example , mystify the other with jargon or use a code known to others in the group , but not the target.
-Seek disagreement- select a sensitive topic.
-Make the other feel uncomfortable-for example , do not avoid silence , joke or use small talks.
-Use taboo words –swear or use abusive or profane language.
-Call the other names –use derogatory nominations

3-Negative impoliteness

Negative impoliteness involves the use of strategies deployed to damage the hearer's negative face wants . Examples of such strategies from Culpeper (1996) include:

-Frighten-instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.
-Condescend, scorn or ridicule- emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous . Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other(e.g. use diminutives)
-Invade the other’s space-literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits)or metaphorically(e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship
-Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect –personalize , use the pronouns "I" and "you".
-Put the other’s indebtedness on record

-Hinder or block the other physically or linguistically

4-Sarcasm or mock politeness

Sarcasm constitutes the use of individual or combined strategies and remains on the surface and appears to be appropriate . On the surface level , the utterances sound polite but their meaning is the opposite . According to Culpeper, sarcasm is mock politeness for social disharmony and it is the opposite of banter which means mock impoliteness for social harmony . Here, the face threatening acts are performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere. Culpeper (2005:49) states that "I once turned up late for a party and upon explaining to the host that I had mistaken 17:00 hours for 7o'clock , I was greeted with a smile and the words "you silly bugger" I knew that the impoliteness was superficial , it was not really and that I had been accepted into the party".

5-Withhold politeness ( Be quiet or fail to use politeness where it is expected)

Culpeper(1996:357) notes that impoliteness may be realized through"[…] the absence of politeness work where it would be expected". Culpeper(2005:44) gives the example that "failing to thank someone for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness" .In this strategy , the speaker does not perform a politeness act where the hearer would expect one. Being silent is also withholding politeness .

## 4. Data Analysis

The present study depends on Culpeper's model (1996:349-367) and therevisited version from Culpeper(2003:1545-79). Culpeper's impoliteness strategies are the

most important tool in this analysis which enable one to combine several strategies with talking. . In this study only the strategy in question is underlined.

## 4.1 Analysis of Impoliteness in The Dumb Waiter(1959)

Excerpt(1)

*Gus. You got any cigarettes ?I've run out .*
*No , I mean , I say the crockery's good . It's very nice .*
*But that's about all I can say for this place . It's worse than*
*the last one . Remember that last place we were in? Last*
*time , where was it? At least there was a wireless there.*
*No, honest . He doesn't seem to bother much about our*
*comfort these days .*
*Ben. When you are going to stop jabbering ? (Act1,Scene1,86-93:135).*

The above conversation between Gus and Ben proves that bald on record impoliteness strategy is clearly used by Ben when he asked Gus by saying 'when you are going to stop jabbering? . Here, Ben tries to attack Gus' face directly and he gets fed up with Gus' speaking and tells him to stop blathering . Moreover, Ben's utterance shows his unwillingness to listen to Gus . Simply looking at his utterance , one can see that Ben behaves impolitely with Gus . So , Ben's utterance has a clear intention to be maximally offensive .

Excerpt(2)

*Ben. They're playing away*
*Gus. Who are?*
*Ben. The Spurs.*
*Gus. Then they might be playing here.*

*Ben. <u>Don't be silly</u> (scene1,31-35:138).*

This conversation reported by Ben, illustrates his impolite behavior with Gus .Ben uses bald on record impoliteness when he says 'Don't besilly' . The word 'silly' itself connotes an insult to Gus .In this conversation even without hearing the tone of voice , it is clear that this expression has a rising intonation which is negatively evaluated in this context . Furthermore, Ben wants to maintain his power by damaging Gus' face want. However, Gus makes an absurd suggestion, so Ben retorts to him in this way.

<u>Excerpt(3)</u>

*Ben. What are you sitting on my bed for?*

*Gus. Nothing .*

*Ben. You have never used to ask me so many damn questions*

*What's come over you?*

*Gus. <u>No, I was just wondering . You've got a job to do. Why don't you just do it and shut up</u>(Act1,Scene1,80-86:143).*

The point to stress in this interaction is that Ben is fed up by Gus' questions and asks Gus why he barrages him with so many questions and tells him to do his job and shut up . The word 'shut up' is an impolite word which involves the loss of face on the part of the hearer . In fact , Ben's impolite behavior with Gus seriously deepens the conflict between them and lead to the break of their relationship. The tone of voice in commanding Gus is very clearly which expresses Ben's negative attitude towards Gus . Furthermore, the expression 'shut up' is not an insult as much as it reflects the speaker's self-derisiveness .The whole utterances could be identified as bald on record impoliteness as it occurs in a direct face to face interaction.

## 4.2 Analysis of Impoliteness in the Caretaker(1960)

Excerpt(4)

*Davies. Them bastards at the monastery let me down again.*

*Aston. Where?*

*Davies. Down in Luton. Monastery at Luton.*

*Aston. What happened when you got there, then?*

*Davies. You know what that bastard monk said to me ?*

*How many more blacks you got around here then?*

*(Act1,Scene2,62-66:11).*

This extract reveals Davies refusal of the monk's bad treatments to him. Davies manipulates positive impoliteness strategy and calling the other names sub-strategy when he says' the bastard monk'. This expression illustrates the impolite behavior of the monk towards Davies and this monk at this monastery doesn't respect old men like Davies. This impolite behavior pushes Davies to start insulting the monk. Davies' utterances are analyzed as negative expressions and these utterances could be interpreted as derogatory in this context. One can see that Davies' impolite behavior is a counter-attack on the aggressive behavior of the monk.

Excerpt(5)

*Davies(to Aston). I said look here, mister , he opened the big door*

*I said , I come all the way down here, look, I said ,I showed*

*him these, you haven't got a pair of shoes to keep me enough*

*I heard you got a stock of shoes here .Piss off, he said to me*

*Now look here, I'm an old man, you can't talk to me like that*

*,I don't care who are you. <u>If you don't piss off , he says ,I'll Kick you all the way to the gate, piss off out of it..</u>*

*(Act1,Scene2,70-76:11)*

This conversation reported by Davies , which illustrates the monk's impolite behavior towards Davies. Here , the monk's expression marks a strong negative attitude and baldly insults Davies . Davies tells Aston about the monk's humiliation towards him. Davies gets angry because of such bad treatment and the monk rudely gives commands to Davies. The second utterance of the monk implies a threat and this will turn to physical violence . In fact, these two commands are deployed by the monk baldly with the purpose of aggravating Davies face . This extract combines between bald on record impoliteness strategy and negative impoliteness of threatening/frightening the hearer.

<u>Excerpt(6)</u>

*Mick. <u>I think I'm coming to the conclusion that you're an old rogue. You're nothing but an old scoundrel</u>.*

*Davies. Now wait-*

*Mick. Listen, you stink.*

*Davies. You ain't got no right to-*

*Mick. <u>You're stinking the place out .You're an old robber. You're an old skate .You don't belong in a nice place like this . You're an old barbarian. Honest, you got no business</u>(Act2,Scene3,109-115:32).*

The point to stress here is that Mick personalized Davies with negative assertions when he says 'you're an old rouge ,an old scoundrel, an old robber ,stink, an old skate and an old barbarian' . These words exemplify the

relationship between impoliteness and power in which Mick aims to damage Davies' negative face and he employs negative impoliteness of explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect by using the pronouns 'I' and 'You'. Mick's negative attitude is clearly expressed in these utterances . It is obvious that Mick combines between impoliteness strategies of negative impoliteness and positive impoliteness of calling the other names such as old skate , old barbarian, old robber ,etc.

### 4.4.3 Analysis of Impoliteness in The Homecoming(1965)

Excerpt(7)

*Max. Do you hear what I'm saying? I'm talking to you!*

*Where's the scissors?*

*Lenny. Why don't you shut up , you daft prat?*

*Max. Don't talk to me like that , I'm warning you.*

*(Act1,Sence1,8-11:7)*

Conflict engagement is a core element of the social interaction of The Homecoming in which conflict and verbal aggressions are part of impoliteness(Culpeper,2011:38). This excerpt reveals Lenny's impolite attitude towards his father especially when he says' Why don't you shut up , you daft prat?'. This expression is completely impolite since Lenny uses an impolite word' shut up' which holds an insult to Max. Importantly, Lenny's behavior reflects that he is a disobedient to his father and the tone of voice in commanding is negatively evaluated because he commands his father to shut up. Lenny employs bald on record impoliteness and reinforces his utterances with positive impoliteness employing calling the other names sub-strategy. Obviously, Max gets angry with Lenny's impolite behavior towards him and he

tries to threaten his son when he says ' don't talk to me like that I warn you'. Max tries to pay Lenny's attention to him in order to respect him.

Excerpt(8)

> *Max. She wasn't such a bad woman. Even though it made me sick just to look at her rotten stinking face, she wasn't such a bad bitch . I gave here the best bleeding years of my life anyway.*
>
> *Lenny. Plug it, will you, you stupid sod, I'm trying to read the paper (Act1,Scene1,20-25:9)*

This dialog takes place between Lenny and Max and this also explains their strong need to compete and such competitiveness is marked by direct and indirect insults. The positive impoliteness strategy is clearly used by Max when he talks about his late wife Jessie and speaks of her with both fondness and shock. He uses inappropriate identity markers sub-strategy to describe her as 'her rotten stinking face'. Then , he moves to talk about her by using taboo word 'bitch' and this word is deployed to offend the hearer. In the second situation, Lenny directly makes a counter-attack with Max and reacts impolitely through which he calls him as stupid sod. Lenny personalized his father with a negative assertion by using negative vocative' you stupid sod'. It is worth noting that Lenny and Max aim to damage each other's face want.

Excerpt(9)

*Sam. After all ,I'm experienced . I was driving a dust cart at the age of nineteen. Then I was in long –distance haulage. I had ten years as a taxi-driver and I've had a five as a private chauffeur .*

*Max. <u>It's funny you never got married , isn't it? A man with all your gifts. Isn't it? A man like you?</u>*

*Sam. There's still time (Act1,Scene1,61-67:14).*

What has happened here is that max mocks Sam's inability to find a bride when he uses the expression' It's funny you never got married'. Max speaks sarcastically with Sam and he manipulates sarcasm/mock politeness to promote disharmony without openly insulting or acting impolitely towards Sam. Furthermore, with sarcasm/mock politeness , the speaker can imply rude things indirectly but the hearer does not realize that . Moreover, Max utters his words in a form of tag question and tag questions could connote sarcasm/mock politeness but the context assigns the interpretation in using these questions(Cobuild,1990:434). Max's utterances appear insincere and sarcasm/mock politeness can never be expressed directly.

<u>Excerpt(10)</u>

*Max. Who's this?*

*Teddy. I was just going to introduce you.*

*Max. <u>Who asked you to bring tarts in here</u>?*

*Teddy. Tarts?*

*Max. <u>Who asked you to bring dirty tarts into this house</u>?*

*Teddy. Listen, don't be silly-*

*Max. <u>We've had a smelly scrubber in my house all night</u>*

*We've had a stinking pox-ridden slut in my house*

*All night(Act1,Scene3, 200-208:41).*

In this interaction, Max meets Teddy and his wife and he is so aggravated to them in their first meeting. Max acts quiet impolitely towards them . In fact, insults are intended to wound the hearer and debase his appearance, beliefs, ability and social relations. Max uses a lot of taboo words to damage Teddy's and Ruth's positive face. He employs positive impoliteness strategy of taboo words. They extremely indicate a negative attitude of the speaker towards the hearer. Max then goes on using abusive expressions and he also uses inappropriate identity marker to describe Ruth when he says ' a smelly scrubber in my house' . He personalized them with negative references .

## 5.Conclusion

This research proves that impoliteness is interpreted differently depending on the context. Thus, impoliteness is a context dependent. Impoliteness can be analyzed from the speaker's and the hearer's perspectives since it depends on the speaker's intention and the hearer's reception. In this data bald on record and positive impoliteness strategies are used frequently more than others. It seems that Pinter employs impoliteness to reveal the life of a modern man who lives in a constant struggle between himself and others to join high status and gain respect . He also shows the impact of two Worlds Wars on modern man's life. Impoliteness leads to a development in character and plot.

## 6.References

Bousfield, Derek. 2007. "Impoliteness in the struggle for power". In *Impoliteness in Language,* Derek Bousfield and Miriam Locher (eds.). Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin.

Bousfield, Derek and Miriam Locher (eds.) 2007. *Impoliteness in Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bousfield, Derek(2008). Impoliteness in interaction.Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins .

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. [1978] 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in languageusage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, Cobuild. 1990. *English Grammar*. Suffolk:Collins

Culpeper, Jonathan(1996). “Towards an anatomy of impoliteness”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25 (3), 349–367.

------------------(1998). (Im)politeness in drama. InVerdonk, Peter,Mick Short and JonathanCulpeper(eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text toContext*. London: Routledge, 83–95.

------------------(2001).*Language and Characterization: People in Plays and other Texts*. London: Longman Pearson Education.

------------------(2005).“Impoliteness andThe Weakest Link”.*Journal of Politeness Research* 1 (1), 35–72.

--------------------(2011). Impoliteness: *Using Language To Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elen, Gino. 2001. *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St. JeromePublishing**.**

Lachenicht, L. G. 1980. “Aggravating language: A study of abusive and insulting language.” *International Journal of Human Communication 13* (4): 607–688.

Leech, Geoffrey N. 2005. “Is there an East-West divide in Politeness?” *Journal of Foreign Languages6*: 1–30.

Locher, Miriam and Derek Bousfield. 2007. ‘Impoliteness and Power in Language.’ In *Impolitenessin Language*, Derek Bousfield and Miriam Locher (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mills, Sara. 2005. “Gender and impoliteness.” *Journal of Politeness Research 1* (1): 263–280.

Pinter, Harold(1959).The Dumb Waiter. London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.

---------------(1960). The Caretaker.London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.

---------------(1965). The Homecoming . New York: Grove Press.

Reiter, Rosina Márquez.(2000).*Linguistic Politeness In Britain And Uruguay A Contrastive Study Of Requests And Apologies*.Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins .

Schauer,Gila A.(2009).*Interlanguage Pragmatic Development*. London:International Publishing Group.